

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka et al. (US 6,075,949, Hatakenaka hereinafter) in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh et al. (US 6,814,510, Sabbagh hereinafter).

Response:

The applicant would like to point out the patentable features of claim 1 with respect to the cited prior art. Claim 1 recites a computer system having a printer manager for generating print data. The printer manager converts raw data into device-dependent print data that is suitable for a specific type of printer.

On the other hand, Hatakenaka's signal processing unit 3 is installed inside a digital camera, which is very different from the claimed computer system. Hatakenaka's use of a digital camera to output printing data is not related to or analogous to a computer system used to generate device-dependent print data. The digital camera is not capable of generating device-dependent print data, which is suitable for only specific types of printers. In addition, Sabbagh also does not teach or suggest generating device-dependent print data, as is claimed.

For these reasons, the applicant submits that the combination of Hatakenaka and Sabbagh fails to teach all of the limitations contained in claim 1, and claim 1 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 4 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/065,782
Amdt. dated September 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 10, 2006

2. Rejection of claims 2-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh and further in view of Shiohara (US 6,618,553).

5

Response:

Claims 2, 3, and 6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 3, and 6 is respectfully requested.

10 3. Rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh and further in view of Nakajima et al. (US 2002/0135687).

15 **Response:**

Claims 7-9 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this
20 case.

Appl. No. 10/065,782
Amdt. dated September 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 10, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 09/28/2006

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)